DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 911 EA 020 580

AUTHOR Welch, A. R.
TITLE Australian Education and the Pacific Rim: An Emerging Relationship.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Western Region Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (Los Angeles, CA, November 12-14, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Developing Nations; *Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; Intercultural Programs; *International Cooperation; *International Educational Exchange; International Programs; International Relations; Multicultural Education; *Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; *Pacific Rim

ABSTRACT

This paper documents the emerging relationship between Australian higher education and the Pacific Rim countries. It offers a chronology of this mutual affiliation and discusses the purposes of Australia fostering its Asian connection within the framework of recent trends to privatize higher education. These purposes include but are not limited to furthering economic ties and multicultural exchanges. In addition, it describes the advantages and disadvantages of fitting changing Australian multicultural domestic and foreign economic and educational policies and practices to joint economic development and intercultural exchange endeavors. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302911

AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION AND THE PACIFIC RIM:

AN EMERGING RELATIONSHIP

A. R. Welch

Department of Social & Cultural Studies

Faculty of Education

The University of New England

Armidale. N.S.W. 2351

Australia

Paper delivered to CIES Western Region Conference

on Education and the Pacific Rim

UCLA, November, 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. R. Welch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 580

Australian Education and the Pacific Rim: An Emerging Relationship

Australia has forged its national identity despite a form of cultural schizophrenia. Situated in South East Asia, its cultural origins were largely British, and its reference points have continued to be largely Anglo-Saxon. Its military history has often involved it in military engagements against Asian or non-Caucasion enemies[1], and its migration policies long discriminated against non-whites.[2]

Nowhere was this cultural schizophrenia more evident than in its several schooling systems.[3] Traditionally, Australian school students learned British history, European history, Australian history. They studied the 'greats' of English literature, mixed perhaps with a sprinkling of Australian writers. They endured, and continue to endure, watered-down versions of 'prefects', 'houses', and other aretfacts of traditional English (Grammar) Schools. Foreign languages, when studied at all, reflected an equally Europocentric bias: Latin, French or perhaps German.[4]

Faced however with a rapidly diversifying population, which over the past two decades has also begun to include significant numbers of migrants and refugees from Asia, and rather fewer from South America, Australian society has changed. Australia's largest trading partner is now Japan, and trading relations with countries of the Pacific rim are expanding. Australian aid to such countries, preeminently Papua New Guinea (P.N.G.) forms a major component of its overall aid budget.[5] No longer can Australia be seen as simply expressive of British values. But what is emerging in its stead?

> "The Australian experience has generated a flood of testimonies to the breakdown of the single cultural ideal in Australian identity, its broadening out from dependence on British foundations. .. But identifying some of these extending forces is one thing; understanding what they are forging is another."[6]

Education has been an important component of Australia's developing relationship with nations of the Pacific rim. Students, both private and sponsored, from these countries study regularly at its schools, colleges and Universities,[7] and education forms approximately 25% of Australia's overall aid budget. This paper will examine some of the major developments in Australian educational policy and practice which are of significance for countries of the Pacific rim. The first of these is the area of overseas student policy and practice.

Overseas Students and Australia

Australia, like Britain, has a strong tradition of state, rather than private, funding of higher education. In Australia, Universities are funded through the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC), as increasingly are Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) and Institutes of Technology. Total enrolments for 1985 were 370,000, of which part-time and external students were increasing at the fastest rate.[8] In 1983, approximately 14,500 overseas students were studying at Australian tertiary institutions, principally at Universities.[9] Malaysia and Hong Kong[10] were the two major donor (or source) countries, with the former being considerably larger. In some faculties, in at least one Australian university (UNSW) the ratio of overseas students to Australian students has risen to 1 to 3 during the 1980s. Over 40% of all postgraduate awards, (Federal Government scholarships, which are

awarded competitively) currently go to overseas students. State funding for 'home' students has fallen significantly since the early 1970s.

Australia has had overseas students attending tertiary institutions for many decades, but not until the Colombo Plan and a heightened interest in connexions between trade and education, was the issue of overseas students brought under public scrutiny. Traditionally, private overseas students, predominantly from Asia, were permitted to enrol in Australian universities provided they had sufficient means to maintain themselves adequately and pay tuition fees. Those who had gained acceptance at an Australian university as full-time students were granted entry to Australia, and could remain, subject to satisfactory progress. Numbers of foreign students at Australian universities increased from around 1,000 in 1950 to about 5,000 in 1965. Most of these students were privately funded.[11]

Concerns were occasionally expressed that foreign students might swamp Australians in higher education,[12] or more often, that such students might use this route as a 'back door' means to gain permanent entry into Australia. During the era of Immigration Restriction Acts (the 'White Australia Policy') the fact that nearly all overseas students came from the Asia and/or Pacific region, and would therefore not have qualified ordinarily for immigrant status helped lend significance to this issue. The gradual growth of a small bureaucracy devoted to looking after the interests of overseas students was accompanied, in the 1960s, by a review of policy towards a more explicit concern with the economic development of

donor countries. Within approximately a year of Labour taking office federally in 1972, the abandonment of the White Australia Policy was paralleled by a policy review which resulted in a limit of 10,000 private overseas students being imposed, and the development requirement being dropped. In 1974 tuition fees were abolished, including for overseas students. Now availability[13] and bona fide student status were to be the principal criteria for entry to Australia. The number of overseas students continued to grow, especially from Malaysia, during the 1970s and there was increasing acceptance of the foreign policy benefits of the overseas students programme. At the same time, there was concern expressed by some at the tendency of some students to not return to their home country at the end of their studies.

In 1979 an interdepartmental committee led to the production of a Report which presaged the abandonment of a numerical limit on overseas students, and instead proposed as a limit "the capacity of Australian institutions to offer places without causing any significant displacement of Australian students."[14] Significant displacement was not defined. The education of overseas students at Australian Universities and Colleges was now seen as a vehicle with which to advance goodwill to Australia among nations of South East Asia and the Pacific. Significantly, an Overseas Student Charge (OSC) of between $1,500 and $2,500 was introduced, but the sums of money raised went to government coffers, rather than the institutions of higher education. To attempt to regulate demand, quotas were set from each country, in the form of guaranteed student approvals (GSAs). Students were now also to be compelled to return to their home country for two years at the completion of their

studies, with minor exceptions. The rate of overseas students remaining in Australia is estimated to have dropped from around 75% in the 1970s to no more than 10% in 1983[15].

Significant protests regarding aspects of the 1979 policy, notably the introduction of the OSC, led to some amelioration. Students already studying in Australia were exempted, and students from Papua New Guinea, and the South Pacific, had their OSC paid from aid funds. Despite protests, the OSC remained, and indeed was increased by 10% in 1981, by a similar amount in the succeeding year, and by about 15% in 1984, raising levels to an average of about $2,500.[16] (As from 1987, overseas students on university postgraduate awards will also have to pay the OSC.) Differences emerged between government departments over the fees issue: the Department of Education favoured no fees since this discriminated against foreign students, Foreign Affairs wanted to hold fees at a level which would not discourage overseas students from studying in Australia, while the Departments of Finance, P.M. and Cabinet, and the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs favoured significant or full fees. In Australia, as in Britain, there were significant elements who argued that the cost of training overseas students should be weighed against the creation of international goodwill, the development of cultural exchange, the possibilities of enhanced trade, and the inflow of funds which accompanied overseas students.

It was however argued, by some, that, while the quality of education offered in Australian higher education is of a reliable quality, the form of education was not always the most appropriate.

In particular, the Report of the Committee to Review the Australian Overseas Aid Programme (the Jackson Report) of 1984 recommended that the traditional model of thesis-alone graduate work be complemented by course-work Doctorates which, it argued, were often more useful, especially for the considerable number of students who want "a breadth of outlook and analytical training, and (a strengthening of) the formal training of their undergraduate studies at home".[17]

By 1984, however, in Australia as in Britain, economics was coming to outweigh equity. The Jackson Report argued that one of the more significant ways in which Australia could help develop countries of the Asian and Pacific region, was by transforming its higher educational institutions into an export oriented industry:

> "The demand for education services throughout the Asian Region is likely to be quite large in the next 20 or so years. The expansion of Australian education to meet this demand would encourage cultural exchanges and tourism. It would provide jobs for Australians directly, and there would be multiplier effects through the provision of food, shelter, clothing and entertainment for students. In American university towns, one 'town' job is generally added for every additional 'gown' enrolled. The development of an education 'export industry', particularly in the graduate field, would benefit the economy directly, and through research it would be linked to the 'high tech' and 'new tech' industries which Australia so strongly wishes to develop."[18]

Questions of equity were discussed in Mutual Advantage. Report of the Committee of Review of Private Overseas Student Policy (the Goldring Report) and the recommendation for a uniform charge was based not only on grounds of administrative simplicity, but also on the basis that any adjustments made to the policy of uniformity would be mainly within the context of Australia's aid programme.

The notion of rating the OSC according to the level of wealth of the country (as perhaps determined by an agency such as the World Bank) was also discussed. The charge was also to be uniform across all faculties, as opposed to the practice of institutions in the U.K., and notional, that is at a continuing rate of about 30-40% of average student cost.[19]

By 1986, even more sacrifices were proposed to the principle of equity, in the interests of economy. The Minister for Education, and the Federal Government, are now committed to the export of educational services. The Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission's (CTEC) Review of Efficiency and Effectiveness in Higher Education (1986) has recommended "the sale of external studies services to overseas students and the sale of the course production and information services and skills,"[20] even though it is argued courses could be provided at less than full average cost, and still be profitable.

Some of the general issues associated with significant levels of private overseas students enrolments in host countries have been pointed to by analysts. There is the financial consideration as to how much institutions should or do subsidize overseas student enrolments, where full cost fees do not operate. This debate can become acrimonious where financial resources are shrinking, and domestic students feel displaced.

Secondly, host institutions are enmeshed in the culture, society and economy of the nation from which they receive their funds, and the epistemic and organizational styles of the host institution are

all affected:

> "Syllabi, texts exercises and examinations all reflect this orientation, as do, more importantly, the conceptual and theoretical paradigms within which such subjects as public administration, organizational behaviour, macro economics, or educational sociology have been conceived for purposes of academic and professional training."[21]

It is not merely that particular theories such as free market economics, may be quite inappropriate and irrelevant to overseas students from systems which exhibit very different features. Nor is it just that some academics may feel threatened by the presence of numbers of overseas students in their classes, with differing demands, backgrounds and interests. The real problem with the assumption that the science of educational administration or industrial architecture is invariant, is that this resistance to cultural relativity can too easily become, in practice, a form of neo-colonialism, whereby Third World students are schooled in the hidden curriculum of western ways, both in relation to their particular studies, and more generally. The possibilities for the real needs of Third World countries being distorted or ignored are quite genuine. As Weiler puts it, in the American context,

> ".. graduate training in American universities in such fields as education, public administration and management, industrial engineering, economics, and most of the other social sciences is based on a body of research and predicated upon a set of corresponding paradigms which are not necessarily applicable or relevant to the social economic and political reality of an underdeveloped country."[22]

And there is no reason to think that Australian (or British) universities are any different in this respect.

It is bad enough that institutions of higher education purvey inappropriate curricula. But insult is added to injury when western knowledge is sold, for large amounts of western currency, to Third World students who often return to their own countries with westernized values, forms of knowledge, and organizational models, which are inappropriate to the development needs of their nation. Indeed, there is a savage irony in the phenomenon of overseas students using significant amounts of their country's financial resources to invest in a form of higher education of dubious value to those development needs.

Further, it is simply not the case that the introduction of full cost fees, sometimes proposed in concert with the introduction of a voucher system, would necessarily make institutions more responsive to any demands of overseas students for relevance. Indeed, it might simply encourage competition between institutions to introduce cosmetic changes, designed to enhance their image. The recent Efficiency and Effectiveness Review in Australia argues that fees are of insufficient importance to effect institutional responsiveness:

> "Where fees are charged they are generally seen as a means of supplementing institutional income rather than as a mechanism for influencing the actions and performance of institutions."[23]

The fact is, fees comprise only a modest proportion of institutional income, the major part coming from the state, or in the case of private institutions from endowments. On the basis of Australian evidence, the Review of Efficiency and Effectiveness in Higher Education concludes that fees are by no means a guarantor of

responsiveness:

> ".. in the decade since fees were abolished Australian higher education .. operated at lower costs per student, while at the same time broadening access and exhibiting a high degree of responsiveness to changed community demands for courses."[24]

Indeed, it can be argued that the selling of higher education is a failure to respond to the needs of the Third World for more widespread development, and a reduction in the widening gap between rich and poor. Marketing higher education simply contributes to the perpetuation of wealthy Third World elites, of existing, stark patterns of inequality, and thereby the continuing dependence of Third World nations. By uncritically marketing higher education to Third World students "we continue to reproduce our own kind, (and thus) we remain part of the problem rather than part of the solution."[25]

The push to privatize higher education in Australia extends beyond selling courses and degrees to the Third World. And clearly, moves to sell off aspects of the national higher education system are, in turn, only part of a wider campaign by conservative interests to sell off public utilities such as Telecom, or national airlines. Indeed, it is important to clarify these connexions, since moves to privatize traditionally public utilities are all predicated upon a view of the services provided as mere commodities. The commodification of higher education presents a striking example of this ideology in practice. Knowledge and education are seen as commodities which may be traded in the market place. Those fortunate individuals who can afford the substantial

fees are educated; those who cannot are neglected. As the case of the Third World students studying in Australia reveals, considerations of equity are being increasingly sacrificed to those of economics.

The ideological component of trends to commodify public resources in various sectors of the economy rests on grounds of efficiency and economy. But such grounds are not easy to evaluate. It has been argued that the simple provision of educational services to wealthy elites from the Third World, at times with insufficient appreciation of the Third World context, is hardly likely to be efficient with respect to the expressed needs of the Third World for more widespread development, and a reduction in the widening gap between rich and poor. The sale of educational services may, however, be efficient at furthering neo-colonialist attitudes and practices, which are against the wider interest. The question of efficiency, then, needs rephrasing: efficiency for who? And: what kind of efficiency?

A second feature of significance in Australian education, which is also of relevance to Australia's relations with countries of the Pacific rim, is that of multiculturalism. As the introduction to this article indicated, tensions exist in Australia between inclinations towards a monocultural value system, and the reality of a highly diverse, multicultural population. What has been Australia's history of policies towards non-British migrants, particularly Asian, and its own indigenous minority?

Australian Multicultural Policy and Practices

In the nineteenth century, exacerbated perhaps by the success of certain non-white groups, notably the Chinese, in setting up flourishing small-business enterprises, racist feelings against minorities ran high. Racist actions and policies could be buttressed by rhetoric which blamed Indians for frightening lonely women, depressing wages and contaminating milk[28], and which depicted Chinese as devious, lascivious and evil. Those of Mediterranean extraction fared little better at times, especially if they involved themselves in occupations the majority considered 'non-white'.[29] Even Christianity was not unsullied by racist doctrines[30] and both newspapers and anthropological journals peddled spurious assumptions about the characters and physical appearances of non-whites.[31]

As late as 1949, and in the face of a considerable influx of non-British migrants, the federal minister of the Department of Immigration cited cultural homogeneity as official policy.[32] And even more recently, in 1971, this concept was still advanced in an unabashed manner in the claim that Australian society was "in fact 97 per cent British".[33] The assumption that no allowance was thought necessary or desirable for the distinctive needs of non-British immigrant groups remained widespread. Such groups should submerge their cultural traditions and values as part of the fair price paid for the joy and security of settling in a new and prosperous land.

> "The bureaucracies ... expressed the temper of the times in refusing to confront the fact that the presence of immigrants of non-English speaking origin had changed the nature of schools and the scope of their own role. Captive to rigid and inflexible structures ... they simply denied that the experience of immigrant children or their teachers was any different from everyone else's".[34]

The decade of the 1970s at last saw increasing recognition of Australia as a multicultural society. This realisation was initially and, perhaps, most commonly expressed in the form of increased interest in immigrant problems and compensatory education programmes. However, as ethnic communities themselves became more politicised, various groups came into existence to demand increased rights. Hence exploration of the concept of multiculturalism paralleled the increasingly strident, and often fragmented, voices of ethnic spokesmen. Multiculturalism therefore became increasingly defined not just as an empirical reality but also as a normative goal.

Most state governments accepted the challenge of producing policy statements affirming and articulating the principle of multiculturalism and specifying the means which should be employed to bring about its realisation. The Education Department of New South Wales, for example, presented a Policy Statement in autumn 1979 affirming multiculturalism as both a fact and a value, and discussing the question of implementation. In setting multiculturalism as an aim to be achieved and in specifying certain objectives, this well-meaning document marks an historical milestone, affecting the direction of education for some years ahead in that state. Yet even here there are grounds to suspect that the level of complexity of the analysis is low and that the proposed objectives are vague. A brief discussion of some aspects listed in the Guideline Statement of this document may make this clearer. For example, while worthy in itself, "the identification and examination of multicultural dimensions to the history of Australia, especially those showing how people from a variety of ethnic backgrounds have

contributed and are contributing to developments in a particular period" is susceptible to trivialisation in the classroom and, more importantly, ignores the legacy of text books most often used in the schools. The document could have well afforded to be somewhat more specific in terms of the implications of this aspect of the adopted policy.

The recent Core Curriculum document of Australia's Curriculum Development Centre[33], a paper very widely read and commented upon, also draws attention to multiculturalism. Multicultural education is "one of a multiplicity of new demands"[34] which schools face, and it is "one of the principles underlying the core curriculum".[35] Yet a study of the "areas of knowledge and experience"[36] commended in the document shows that the demand and principle are little respected. Of the nine "areas" listed, multicultural perspectives are seen to be clearly relevant to only one, the "area of civic, social and cultural studies" where "the scope of these studies should include the diverse sub-cultures and common cultures in Australia (including ethnic and aboriginal sub-cultures) and in other societies".[37] Other curriculum areas - Arts and Crafts; Work, Leisure and Life-style; Moral Reasoning and Values; Communications; and Health Education - are obvious candidates for multicultural perspectives, and yet this is completely ignored. Indeed in the outline of the section on the Communications area it is declared that "it would be difficult to justify at present ... foreign and ethnic languages as part of a practical core for all students".[38] This hardly vindicates the principle of multiculturalism as a criterion which must be satisfied in planning the core curriculum!

But there is a further and fatal flaw in the document underlying this particular problem: this is the failure to base the discussion on the realities of present-day Australian society, and the blurring of the distinction between fact and value, when deriving aims and objectives. When discussing aims for Australian schools, to claim that the Australian way of life should promote values such as "tolerance and concern for the rights and beliefs of others" or "equality of access to and enjoyment of education, health, welfare and other community services"[18] could be seen as relatively unobjectionable. Yet even such a statement may mask as much as it reveals. Equality may not mean equality of traditions but equality of access to one particular tradition - the "tradition of the white man".[19]

But, to proclaim that these features actually characterise Australian society lays the document open to the empirical rebuttal evidenced in the majority of current sociological analyses of Australian society. Clearly the claim is empirically false. If it were true, there could have been no White Australia policy. If it were true, there would be no need for minority activism or multicultural conferences seeking to explore (and vitiate) the monocultural basis of Australian institutions and values.

If Australian attitudes and practices towards migrants from countries of the Pacific Rim has not always been enlightened, and one must not forget incidents such as the pressganging of Kanakas to work in the Queensland sugar fields of the nineteenth century, what then of Australian attitudes and practices towards its own indigenous minority, Australian Aboriginals. Here Australia has a

particularly tragic record.

If we open the Pandora's box of Australian multicultural society what may we discern? The picture for Australians of aboriginal and islander descent is not a pretty one:

> "They have probably the highest (population) growth, the highest birth-rate, the highest death rate, the worst health and housing, and the lowest educational, occupational, economic, social and legal status of any identifiable section of the Australian population".[11]

The stages of black/white relations in Australia can be briefly periodised as follows:

- initial white ignorance and disdain (accompanied by the establishment of some church missionary schools);
- "legal and spatial separation"[12] which meant in many cases the forcible removal of children from their parents for schooling;
- assimilation, in which it was assumed that the simple opening-up of access to white institutions of unchanged values would lead to equality;
- integration, in which token deference to aboriginal culture was accompanied by growing black unrest;
- and self-determination, in which funding is still in the hands of the whites.

Aboriginal participation in education remains notoriously low. It is almost non-existent at the tertiary level. Participation rates of Aboriginal pupils in secondary schools, expressed as a proportion of the ten-to-nineteen age cohort, rose from 15.1 per

cent in 1966 to 28.5 per cent in 1973.'' In that latter year, 57 aboriginal enrolments were recorded in Australian universities. Aboriginal retention rates are also abysmal. In 1971 22.6 per cent of white pupils progressed beyond the third form (15+ years of age). Of aboriginal pupils only 2.1 per cent did so.

Although Aboriginal participation has increased substantially in the past decade, it is still extremely low. For example, Aboriginal retention from Year 10 to Year 12 rose from 9.1% in 1976 to 15.1% in 1982. Equally, enrolments in higher education have increased several fold over the same period but from an extremely narrow base: 174 enrolled students in 1976 compared with 617 in 1983.

Educational participation and retention are reflected in employment profiles, when black is compared to white. A handful of aboriginals in high pay/high status occupations face an overwhelming proportion who work in the lowest socio-economic categories - agricultural work, domestic service, mining, unskilled labouring. Even those aboriginals who complete school and gain secondary qualifications face discrimination in respect of employment. Poverty is widespread. Health and housing services are sub-standard. Low self-esteem, racist text-books, the attitudes and expectations both of teachers and of the community, and linguistic and cultural differences all conspire together to militate against success.''

But our exploration of this Pandora's box is patently incomplete. What do its contents reveal in respect of the treatment of post-1945 Australian immigrants? Here again, multicultural

rhetoric is belied by the demon of differential treatment, for example, inequalities in the kind of employment undertaken by immigrants. Ethnicity, employment and social class often went unlinked in traditional Australian sociological analysis. Recently, however, this deficiency has been remedied. Studies of Australian poverty have particularly shown the simple fact of being an immigrant from a non-English-speaking background significantly increases one's chances of being poor.[15]

At the start of the 1970s immigrant workers began to assert themselves in the trade unions, traditionally dominated by the Anglo-Australians. The response of established politicians to this was to incorporate the more conservative ethnic spokespersons into political advisory bodies. Such spokespersons very often came from established, skilled and better-paid jobs. In this way Australia's establishment attempted to contain the ethnic problem or, at the very least, to influence how the problem was socially constructed. Jakubowicz has argued that ethnicity as a social construct was linked to multiculturalism partly as a means of asserting geographic derivation over social class as the most meaningful category of social analysis.[16] The falseness of this approach was aggravated by the Galbally Report of 1978 in which it was claimed that "the main causesof unemployment amongst migrants are the same as for Australian-born workers".[17] This assertion was patently untrue. Migrant workers, especially migrant women workers, are heavily over-represented in unskilled jobs in industries with high risks of unemployment.[18] The point is that by refusing to acknowledge the disjunction between the public affirmation of egalitarian principles, and the reality of differentiation and inequality which

is active and growing, Galbally and traditional studies helped to obscure the process by which this differentiation and inequality is produced and maintained.

One of the crucial aspects of the process of maintaining differentiation is the internal response to immigration. Lever Tracy has argued, on the basis of studies of occupational patterns by country of birth, that ethnic occupational ghettoes are being formed, that the Australian working class is being ethnically segmented, and that the skills and experience which immigrants bring to Australia are being ignored.[49] The thrust of this argument is important. It does not propose ethnicity as a barrier to other forms of exploitation or differentiation. Ethnic differentials should be rendered problematic and should not be tautologically explained. It is multiculturalism which in fact erects the ethnic barrier to further explanation.

> "It is the invalidation of the class history of ethnic Australians and the reconstruction of their experience and histories in their countries of origin and in Australia as totally cultural (that is, as specifically non-political, non-class based and, in that sense, ahistorical) that is the effective outcome of multiculturalism as an ideology".[50]

Hence the development of Australian education has suffered from a dual deficit. Not only has it exhibited the analytical problem outlined above, but, as a result, it has also largely failed to come to grips with the multicultural reality of Australian society.

And if a rethinking is not "on a systematic state-by-state basis likely to affect the schooling of every Australian child in the near future"[51] then we shall be left with the often useless current

conceptions of multicultural education which view it as yet one more discrete element to be added to the over-burdened curriculum. This conception restricts and blunts the need for a multicultural emphasis to be given to the whole curriculum, in all Australian schools, with or without large ethnic populations.''

Even worse, the educational disadvantage experienced by migrants was not even clearly documented until relatively recently. The Fitzgerald Report of 1976 complained that "there are almost no data available which show patterns of school achievement or of school-leaving for migrants. "Thus", they argued, "we lacked the base data to calculate participation or retention rates for migrant students, or to develop broad relationships between factors such as social class". Indeed there was "little agreement as to what constitutes a 'migrant' student".'' High aspirations were found to be common to most migrant groups, although significant differences existed between different ethnic groups, and between males and females of the same group. Substantial overall wastage was pointed to, however. Economic difficulties were compounded by ignorance of available financial assistance. Such information was often only published in English, until recently. The report pointed to the need for bilingual teachers and interpreters to be recruited from Australia and overseas. It recommended that major ethnic languages be taught at many schools, while smaller linguistic communities should have access to at least one school with an appropriate curriculum. Vietnamese, Indonesian or Chinese are now being offered at some Australian schools, public and private.

The contemporary educational scene reflects the fact that

although the concept of multi-cultural education has been widely debated, analysed and justified (although often in a rather abstract manner), not enough has been done to further its intelligent implementation within the school system. Possibly the reason is that large-scale structural changes would need to be made to Australian society for it to operate effectively. Literature abounds on the benefits of multi-cultural education, both for society and the individual,[1] but concrete examples of its successful practical implementation are too rare.

What then are the practical barriers to implementation of multi-cultural education in Australian schools? The actual content of a multi-cultural curriculum may be of lesser import, and approaches will vary greatly in response to differing local needs and population composition. Curriculum planning can take this increasingly into account as recent moves to greater responsibility by individual schools for curriculum design occur in Australian education. There are, nevertheless, moderating influences to be taken into account. As recent moves towards school-based curriculum development in Australian states demonstrate, the role of centralised departmental bureaucrats is changing in theory from being mandatory to being supportive. Thus while schools still operate according to the regulatory demands of State Department of Education stipulations, senior syllabuses, and so on, they can potentially call upon extra resources in the form of teaching materials, research findings, and specialists in the field. The regional organisations of schools can act as a mediating force between central administration and individual schools, and between individual schools in the same district.

Until all students (i.e. secondary and tertiary) in Australia are exposed to a variety of foreign cultures, both indigenous Australian and those of Our Pacific Neighbours'', in a manner which is both more thorough and sensitive than has been the case in the past, the development of a multicultural attitude in Australia will continue to be inhibited. Overt and covert racism still exist in our school and college texts. Studies have revealed a sometimes slanderous ethnocentrism with respect to the treatment of Australian Aboriginals, and countries of the Pacific. Many examples can be given of outright racism, however the message is generally more subtle and inoccuous, but just as effective. In one content analytic study of Australian school texts, Noronha found numerous examples of both overt and covert ethnocentrism in the treatment of India in school textbooks.'' Current financial stringencies, too, are slowing the pace of change.

Australian Education and Relations with Pacific Nations

The two areas of overseas student policy and practice, and multiculturalism are only two more obvious educational themes of relevance to Australis'a emerging relationship with countries of the Pacific Rim. The whole issue of privatization in Australian education, for example the privatization of research in higher education'', is also of concern, given the general questions of equity in relationship to Third World students studying at Australian universities.

But the whole theme of Australia's international relations with countries of the Pacific Rim is a complex one. One of the more important themes in this emerging relationship is that of trade

versus aid, and the role education has to play in this. Traditionally in Australia, considerations of humanitarian aid have been at variance with more economically driven questions of trade. Education has traditionally been far more in the former camp, than the latter. But recent cutbacks in many areas of government expenditure, including the education sector, have precipated a push by federal Ministers of Trade, and more recently Ministers of Education, to exploit the higher education system in Australia as a means of earning export income. For traditional Labour Party supporters, the paradox of seeing an avowedly social-democratic government abandoning questions of equity, and pushing energetically the sale of educational services to Australia's neighbours in the Pacific, has been difficult to digest. The educational component of Australia's overall aid budget is, it would appear, contracting, despite attempts to gloss over this fact by inflating the figures, through inclusion of the costs of private overseas students in the aid figures.

By far the greater portion of Australia's aid, both multilateral and bilateral, is directed towards Commonwealth countries. 72% of all bilateral funds are so directed,[10] the major exceptions being the People's Republic of China, the Phillipines, Indonesia and Thailand. Equally, of the 18,000 or enrolled students from developing countries education in Australia, approximately 15,000 (83%) were from Commonwealth countries, in 1984[11] and a high proportion of sponsored students in Australia also come from Commonwealth countries. Given that estimates of the level of unmet demand in Australian higher education (i.e. qualified Australian students who are unable to find a place), is variously estimated to

be between 15,000 and 25,000 the issue of private overseas students in Australian higher education is likely to continue to be divisive.

But how is educational aid from Australia received in the Pacific? Clearly, over the last decade or so, "we have observed an increasing interest and involvement of Australian government in the Pacific"[80]. Individual Australian universities are either linking themselves with 'sister' universities in the region (as for example with links between the University of Western Australia (U.W.A.) and the Prince of Songkla University in Thailand), or taking charge of particular development projects (as with the University of New England's Bogor Project, in Indonesia). These links may cover research collaboration, staff exchanges, development assistance, and postgraduate training.[81] The Sims Report of 1976 (Australia and the South Pacific: Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence) encouraged the extended provision of education and training consonant with expressed needs of South Pacific nations. Subsequent reports stressed the need to enhance the abilities of local and regional institutions of higher education such as the University of the South Pacific (U.S.P.) in Suva, Fiji.

But developments over recent years have tended to stress the involvement of Australian Colleges and Universities in educational development at the expense of regional institutions, such as USP. This has provoked charges of neo-colonialism, since it is argued that liberalization of policy towards overseas students in Australian higher education, together with the use of bilateral aid to enable them to pursue those studies, effectively weakens regional and national institutions of higher education in the South Pacific.

It has further been argued that the millions of dollars spent on educational projects in nations such as Tonga, Western Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Kiribati, could have been far more effectively spent by deploying the resources of indigenous academics at institutions such as USP. The following description of one such project, by a school Principal from a country in the South Pacific lends weight to some of these charges:

> "In December '85 Dr. X visited my school. He returned again in March '86 with an official and an architect and they produced a physical plan of the school which would cost $A4m. The plan would cost more than the budget of my country for any one year. In July '86 a Japanese team visited the school at the request of the Australian government to fund the project ... but nothing has been done so far ... I pointed out to Dr. X some of the difficulties of filling in for teachers going on training leave. Dr. X then came up with a plan of sending teachers to Australia for a year's training and they would be replaced by Australian teachers.
>
> Dr. X suggested that I take a visit to Brisbane, Townsville, Sydney and Wollongong ... I did not ask for the visit. At the visit, I met all the important people ... and was told that the project would spend next year, 1987 ... I feel there was a lot of salesmanship by those involved ... everything seemed possible. The money consideration was brought up only in the last two days of my two weeks visit."[82]

In the areas of overseas student policy and practice, multiculturalism, and the role of education in trade and aid, Australia's role is changing. To the extent that Australia is giving higher priority to its relationship with countries of the Pacific Rim, and especially the South Pacific, this is a worthwhile development. But in an era of increasing economism, fuelled by financial stringencies often of an international origin, Australia must beware that questions of educational relations and aid are not swamped by those of trade and economic advantage.

Notes

[1] Turkey (World War One), Japan (World War Two), Korea, Malaya, Vietnam.

[2] Australia's Immigration Restriction Acts, colloquially known as the White Australia Policy only formally ended with the election of the reformist Whitlam Labour Government of 1972.

[3] Australian primary (Elementary) and secondary schooling is largely controlled and funded by the six state governments, although there is Federal funding for special programmes such as the Disadvantaged Schools Programme, and science grants for secondary schools. Higher education, by contrast, is very largely Commonwealth (Federal) funded.

[4] The latter of course being somewhat less popular when Australia was at war with Germany, in 1914-18, and 1939-45.

[5] Major Components of Australian Official Development Assistance, 1985-86

	$ million
Bilateral aid to Papua New Guinea	318.5
Bilateral aid projects and technical cooperation	211.0
Bilateral training (including Commonwealth subsidy of $97.4 million for overseas students in Australia)	134.3
Food aid	121.2
Support for non-government aid organisations	11.0
Multilateral aid programs (including United Nations, Commonwealth and regional bodies)	60.6
Emergency humanitarian relief and other programs	11.8
International financial institutions	110.4
Administrative costs	21.2
Expenditure by other governmental bodies less miscellaneous revenue	25.9
Total	1025.9

[6] Jones, P., Australia's International Relations in Education, Australian Council for Educational Research 1986, p.3.

Sponsored Students and Trainees in Australia by Country and Region, 1980 and 1984

	1980			1984		
	Students	Trainees	Total	Students	Trainees	Total
Africa	259	114	373	264	127	391
South America and Caribbean	21	29	50	44	19	63
Asia -						
China	34	5	39	76	36	112
Hong Kong	10	0	10	10	1	11
Indonesia	281	32	313	353	116	469
Malaysia	130	90	220	90	71	161
Pakistan	27	17	44	14	11	25
Philippines	50	55	105	96	119	215
Singapore	110	24	134	104	13	117
Sri Lanka	61	24	85	51	3	54
Thailand	162	66	228	191	124	315
Other Asia	218	138	356	131	96	227
Middle East	22	4	26	24	11	35
South Pacific -						
Fiji	66	34	100	77	34	111
PNG	66	209	275	83	147	230
Solomon Islands	14	26	40	12	4	16
Tonga	24	15	39	29	8	37
Other South Pacific	38	51	89	24	51	75
Total	1593	933	2526	1673	991	2664

Private Overseas Tertiary and Post-Secondary Students in Australia by Country and Region, 1976 to 1984.

	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
Africa	91	91	105	103	86	148	130	154	141
South America and Caribbean	0	16	19	27	21	24	22	21	15
Asia -									
China	23	2	0	1	2	13	15	35	90
Hong Kong	421	574	662	884	1 131	1 122	1 139	1 388	1 658
Indonesia	490	538	514	488	423	365	371	593	943
Malaysia	3 139	3 094	3 123	3 580	4 001	4 619	5 353	6 016	7 341
Pakistan	22	32	27	38	41	36	38	41	43
Philippines	28	28	27	23	17	18	70	26	30
Singapore	137	369	347	326	328	374	502	723	782
Sri Lanka	48	56	76	92	100	102	122	123	131
Thailand	258	270	257	241	214	191	170	151	152
Other Asia	396	361	345	394	366	419	428	449	559
Middle East	0	0	0	0	42	37	48	58	70
Europe -									
Great Britain	74	67	82	89	95	91	68	122	108
Other Europe	53	63	85	88	77	81	73	99	120
North America	97	72	94	107	139	113	117	132	162
South Pacific -									
Fiji	109	130	148	150	193	242	322	420	532
PNG	8	17	14	22	26	31	33	31	48
Solomon Islands	2	13	12	9	12	13	15	6	16
Tonga	27	19	22	22	19	19	43	45	59
Other South Pacific	48	34	34	45	37	32	35	22	28
Unspecified	21	6	11	16	13	13	11	1	19
Total	5 486	5 852	6 004	6 745	7 383	8 103	9 125	10 656	13 047

[9] See Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, Review of Efficiency and Effectiveness in Higher Education, A.G.P.S., 1986.

[9] Fraser, S.E., 'Overseas Students in Australia: 'Governmental Policies and Institutional Programs', Comparative Education Review, 28, 2, 1984, p.283. Goldring puts the figure somewhat lower. See Mutual Advantage Report of the Committee of Review of Private Overseas Student Policy, Canberra AGPS 1984, p.34.

[10] Ninety percent of overseas students at higher educational institutions in Australia are from Asia. Fraser, 'Overseas ..', p.281.

[11] Mutual ..., p.30. The University of New South Wales was one to be concerned with potential displacement of Australians. See Fraser, 'Overseas ..', p.288, 1984, p.30. The proportion of overseas students in 1965 was about 10% of the total student population, approx. the same as for 1983.

[12] These concerns are still being voiced. See Fraser, 'Overseas ..', pp. 289-90.

[13] That is, the availability of the course in the home country of the overseas student. However, the system was open to some manipulation by students who might nominate an 'unavailable' course then change courses upon arrival in Australia.

[14] Mutual ..., p.32.

[15] Ibid., p.33.

[16] According to the Jackson Report, this represents about one third of the price of educating an overseas post-secondary student. See Report of the Committee to Review The Australian Overseas Aid Program, Canberra AGPS 1984 p.91. This also estimates the overall cost of educating private and public funded overseas students, including administration at more than $82,000,000 in 1983/4.

[17] Ibid., p.93.

[18] Ibid., pp.93-4. The job creation ratio referred to seems a most extraordinary one.

[19] See Mutual ..., Pp.94-5.

[20] Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, Review of Efficiency and Effectiveness in Higher Education, AGPS 1986, ¶ 7.52.

[21] Weiler, H., 'The Political Dilemmas of Foreign Study', Comparative Education Review, 28, 2, 1984, p.270.

[22] Ibid., p.272.

[23] C.T.E.C. Review ..., ¶ 8.13.

[24] Ibid., ¶ 8.14.

[25] Weiler, 'Political ..', p.280.

[26] Yarwood, A.T., Asian Migration to Australia: The Background to Exclusion, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1964, pp. 124-5.

[27] Evans, R., et al., Exclusion, Exploitation and Extermination: Race Relations in Colonial Queensland, Sydney, Australia and New Zealand Book Co., 1975, p.6.

[28] Ibid., p. 102.

[29] Ibid., p.6; De Leverpanche, M. "From Race to Ethnicity", in Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, Vol. 16, n.1, 1980, p.28.

[30] For details of the extraordinary assumptions which underlay this computation, see Grassby, A., 'Preamble, Submission from the Commissioner for Community Relations (to the National Inquiry into Teacher Education', (Auchmuty), unpublished mimeo, no date. It is perhaps for this kind of reason that Bottomley could recently claim that "our so-called 'migration programme' stopped being programmatic as soon as the immigrants set foot on Australian soil". Bottomley, G., 'Migration Studies: Quo Vademus (Quid facemus?)', in Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, Vol. 17, n.3, 1981, p.71.

[31] Grassby, A., First Annual Report of the Commissioner for Community Relations, A.G.P.S., 1976.

[32] Martin, J., The Migrant Presence, Sydney, George Allen & Unwin, 1978, p.133.

[33] Core Curriculum for Australian Schools, Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra, Australia, 1980.

[34] Ibid., p.12.

[35] Ibid., p.15.

[36] Ibid., p.18.

[37] Ibid., p.19.

[38] Ibid., p.18.

[39] Ibid., p.10.

[40] Feyerabend, P., Science in a Free Society, London, New Left Books, 1978, p.76.

[41] Population and Australia: A Demographic Analysis and Projection, Canberra A.G.P.S., 1975, II, p.455.

31

[42] Fitzgerald, R. et al. Poverty and Education in Australia, Canberra, A.G.P.S. 1976, p.183.

[43] Ibid., p.187.

[44] However, Aboriginal Study Grants, (available at most levels of education), Community Colleges and training programmes to train Community Development Officers, and the training of teachers and teacher assistants have all been instituted with some success. Cultural alienation of participants, too-rigid imitation of white teaching patterns, and even, in at least one state, differential pay-rates represent continuing difficulties. See Bourke, B., "Aboriginal Education" in The Educational Magazine, Victoria Education Department, Vol. 33, n.4, 1976.

[45] Cox, D. and Martin, J. Welfare of Migrants, Canberra, A.G.P.S. 1975; Sackville, R., Poverty and the Law, Canberra, A.G.P.S., 1976; Fitzgerald, R., Op.cit. 1976, Henderson, R., Poverty in Australia: First Main Report, Canberra, A.G.P.S., 1975.

[46] Jakubowicz, A., 'State and Ethnicity: Multiculturalism as Ideology', in Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, Vol. 17, n.3, 1981.

[47] Galbally, F., et al., Migrant Services and Programmes: Report of the Review of Post-Arrival Programmes for Migrants, A.G.P.S., 1978.

[48] Lever Tracy, C. 'Labour Market Segmentation and Diverging Migrant Incomes', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 17, 2, 1981.

[49] One of the problems here is the consistent refusal to accept professional and trade qualifications from other than Europe, North America, Britain and New Zealand. Thus although many migrants are employed at a lower level than prior to immigration, this is probably at least partly due to different patterns of recognition of qualifications. Lack of English was another job-sorting mechanism which helped determine whether the initial job was commensurate with skill level. See Lever Tracy, Op. cit. 1981, p.25.

[50] Jakubowicz, Op.cit. 1981, p.6

[51] Grassby, 1976 (Op.cit.) p.3.

[52] It would seem that the same problem underlies recent state government moves to incorporate demonstration of competence in multi-cultural education as a criterion for promotional purposes.

[53] Fitzgerald, R. Op.cit. p.53.

[54] See for example Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in the Schools, Canberra, A.G.P.S., 1976, Table 2.

[55] The title of a very popular school social studies textbook of the 1960s, which still contained ethnocentric attitudes.

32

[56] Noronha, L., 'The Presentation of India in Australian School Texts', M.Ed. University of New England, 1978.

[57] For a fuller analysis of recent developments in relationship to the privatization of research in higher education in Australia, see Welch, A.R. 'For Sale, By Degrees', ANZCIES Conference, 1986.

[58] Jones, P.W. 1986, (Op.cit.), p.55.

[59] Ibid., p.55. It is noteworthy that some 25% of the world's population live in Commonwealth countries.

[60] Baba, T., Academic Buccaneering Australian Style: The Role of Australian Academics in the South Seas', ANZCIES Paper, University of Queensland, November 1986, p.1.

[61] Even the University of Sydney, and the University of California have an arrangement whereby a handful of students from each institution can be sent to the other country for a year's study. In Australia, the OSC does not apply to these students.

[62] Baba, T., 'Academic Buccaneering, Australian Style', Paper, ANZCIES Conference, University of Queensland, November 1986, p.7.